

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 93 18:44:21 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1438  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Wed, 8 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1438

Today's Topics:

ARRL's callsign admin position  
Identification procedures - unlicensed person  
Info-Hams Digest V93 #1435 (fwd)  
R/C Aircraft  
Scratchi, January, 1960  
UHa (U of Hartford) club active?  
Univ of Hartford ARC  
W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 7 Dec 93 19:40:00 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <L445Dc2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,  
> Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:  
> >The do NOT represent "\_all\_" hams.  
>  
> If they don't, who does? I guarandamntee you that \_someone\_ must, or else we  
> are sunk.  
>  
> > They do not pepresent me at this time

> >and there are MANY hams that I know who are not members of the ARRL.  
> >Although, as I have previously stated, I feel that the ARRL is doing a  
> >pretty good job of late, I tend to agree with Greg in that the ARRL  
> >seems to feel that they are the 'one true voice of all amateur radio'.  
> >They are NOT. They may represent a good portion, maybe a majority, but  
> >in NO way do they represent ALL Amateurs!  
>  
> Someone does. That someone is the ARRL, by default if nothing else.  
>  
> >As I said, I have been impressed of late and am considering sending the  
> >ARRL a dues check. However there are many organizations that represent a  
> >good number of amateurs (W5YI as an example).  
>  
> Hate to tell you this, guy, but Fred Maia, W5YI, is not an organization - he'  
> a newsletter publisher.

For the purposes of some recent proposals, I believe, W5YI represented  
itself as an organization (quoting a membership of all it's  
subscribers). And W5YI is a VEC, does he do all the work himself?

But, maybe you are right, we need a second national ham group. Anyone  
wanna help me start one?

>  
> The only groups I'm aware of that even try to be a national voice are QCWA -  
> which, by definition, only represents those who were hams at least 25 years  
> ago (and therefore neither me nor you) - and Don Stoner's NARA, which is  
> explicitly aimed at the new ham.

(see above)

>  
> > Now, the other  
> >organizations have not been around as long as the ARRL and are just  
> >getting started. However they are growing. The age of the ARRL being the  
> >exclusive national ham organization is long past.  
>  
> There is \_NO\_ other national ham organization designed for all.

If not there is a need, indeed. (ARGH! Puckey pun!)

>  
> >If my congressman called the FCC it would make an impact. And believe  
> >you, me, MY congressman is willing to listen to those of us who sent  
> >him to DC.  
>  
> ...but is your congressman aware of how hams around the country feel about  
> issues, and the national importance of ham radio? There's a fundamental

> difference between Dan pickersgill, constituent, and ham radio. We need both.  
>  
> >W5YI and all the other groups that have proposed to take over the  
> >'vanity licensing' proposal.  
>  
> The League had valid points, even if the overall presentation let something t  
> be desired. (Yes, I have let my director know what I thought of that.) Again,  
> \_none\_ of those groups are for all hams; they're for some subset of hams.

Again, I think W5YI might take exception. (Not that I speak for W5YI, I  
do NOT!)

>  
> > Wayne Green bashing is a usefull as ARRL  
> >bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green isn't claiming to be the 'one true  
> >voice of amateurs').  
>  
> ...not to mention that Wayne Green is much more of a buffoon than anyone with  
> the League ever thought of being.

Wayne Green bashing is a usefull as ARRL bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green  
isn't claiming to be the 'one true voice of amateurs').

(There I go repeating myself. This is the N8PKV REPEATER.)  
(At least I am not talking to myself.)

> >Since when has our (amateur community) relationship with the FCC become  
> >totally adversarial?  
>  
> 220 MHz.

I said "totally".

> If you don't understand that, you have completely missed the essential  
> bureaucratic mindset. That grab was the result of a bureaucracy run amok, and  
> bureaucracies don't forget.

Private interests had SOMETHING to do with it.

> >As I have said, the ARRL is improving. (Can we get rid of incentive  
> >licensing now guys? Like the social programs of the 60's, it isn't in  
> >the national interest.) (There I said it, look out now!)  
>  
> I'd flame that one, but it's been hashed over quite a bit as it is; short for  
> answer is that while we're implementing the welfare state in ham licensing, w  
> might as well do away with that too. (That was sarcasm.)

That 'welfare state' arguement is so pathtic, no one has suggested that.

Even the corallary is a far stretch.

Welfare doesn't further the national interest, neither does incentive licensing. We should loose both.

(I do not intend to invite a flame. But I had to respond.)

>

> >No. Just honest and truly representative of its members.

>

> Again, you totally fail to understand the bureaucratic mindset. Any group tha  
> comes across as fragmented to a bureaucrat will get completely ignored.

Jay, I honestly hope that our relationship with the FCC is not as bad as you say (in fact I know it is not from the dealings our area hams have with the FCC). If it were, Amateur Radio would be lost.

I can agree to some of what you said. United front and all. But before the ARRL desides what all amateurs want, maybe they could come out of the board room and ask a few of us?

73,

--

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----
```

```
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

-----

Date: Mon, 06 Dec 93 18:00:09 CST

From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!news.oc.com!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!  
scilab!carter@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Identification procedures - unlicensed person

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

cravitma@cps.msu.edu (Matthew B Cravit) writes:

> I was wondering -- since it is permissible for an unlicensed  
> individual to use a radio in an emergency, and since it is possible  
> that I may be faced with an "official FCC-approved grade A emergency"  
> between now and when the FCC finally gets around to sending me my  
> license, what is the established procedure (if any) for an unlicensed  
> operator to identify him/herself if attempting to obtain emergency

> help?

Ahoy, Matthew!

I would caution anyone that they should not "go looking" for opportunities to transmit where they're not licensed. Having made that disclaimer, let me take a shot at your (very good) question and see if there are any nay-sayers.

In communicating with anyone in an emergency, keep your message content simple and avoid jargon. If you are not licensed for the band in question, simply state your name and, in the same breath, say that you have emergency information for any station (or for a specific station, if you know it).

Anyone on the frequency should know how to proceed given that. After that, simply pass along the pertinent information. Tell the station you're speaking with your full name and that they can call you back on the same frequency using your name. Then be sure to stay on that frequency until help arrives. If the remote station asks for any information about you, answer it honestly and concisely.

If anyone on any frequency questions your reason for being on that frequency, don't get flustered and don't be difficult. Simply re-state that THIS IS AN EMERGENCY and IMMEDIATE HELP IS NEEDED.

The rest, you have to play by ear. But some things to think about:

1. If the station you have contacted will not know when help has arrived, call them back and tell them so. The "communication event" should have a definite ending. Again, if you are not licensed for that band, use your full name in any place where you would normally use a callsign.
2. If you have been in contact with a specific organization, say a sheriff's office or coast guard station, identify yourself as reporting party to officials on site once the scene has been stabilized. They will probably want some information about you for their reports. It won't go over well if you "disappear into the night" after such a non-standard method of calling for help.
3. \*\*\* MOST IMPORTANT \*\*\* Be sure not to interfere with any agency's communications or actions once the emergency has been reported. Go ahead and call back with additional information if it is truly warranted (e.g. number of and nature of injuries, drastic change in medical status), but don't be a burden to an agency's normal operations. Make no unnecessary transmissions.

Well, that's what I'd do anyway. Any other opinions?

Cheerio!

-----  
Carter R. Bennett, Jr. [Scientist]  
carter@scilab.lonestar.org  
KI5SR  
-----

Date: 9 Dec 93 01:37:15 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1435 (fwd)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

unsubscribe apark@memes.lib.indiana.edu

----- Forwarded message -----  
Date: Wed, 8 Dec 93 04:30:10 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@UCSD.EDU>  
To: Info-Hams@UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1435

Info-Hams Digest                      Wed, 8 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 1435

Today's Topics:

ARRL's callsign admin position  
How to Calibrate an SWR meter

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Mon, 06 Dec 93 09:14:56 EST  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <gregCHMBrt.Err@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote  
> >As far as I can tell, the ARRL's position is that they are the one and only  
> >voice of Amateur Radio in the US,  
>  
> They \_are\_ the only organization for \_all\_ hams. I may not agree with them all  
> the time, but there simply is no alternative.

The do NOT represent "\_all\_" hams. They do not represent me at this time and there are MANY hams that I know who are not members of the ARRL. Although, as I have previously stated, I feel that the ARRL is doing a pretty good job of late, I tend to agree with Greg in that the ARRL seems to feel that they are the 'one true voice of all amateur radio'. They are NOT. They may represent a good portion, maybe a majority, but in NO way do they represent ALL Amateurs!

As I said, I have been impressed of late and am considering sending the ARRL a dues check. However there are many organizations that represent a good number of amateurs (W5YI as an example). Now, the other organizations have not been around as long as the ARRL and are just getting started. However they are growing. The age of the ARRL being the exclusive national ham organization is long past.

>  
> > 1) The League's history of opposing any petition which does not  
> > come through them, as a matter of routine (a.k.a. 'not invented  
> > here' syndrome')  
>  
> Bosh. They have supported many petitions they did not originate; one example  
> that springs immediately to mind is the one about restricting responsibility  
> for retransmitted communications, which was originated by a couple of hams  
> here in Texas, K5FOG and N5GAR.  
>  
> > 2) Having been told by League officers and staffers that if I  
> > left the ARRL, I was giving up all of my representation in  
> > Washington (as if I don't vote in Federal elections?).  
>  
> ...but your representation as a voter is not necessarily the same, or even  
> close to the same, as your representation as a ham via ARRL. ARRL has the only  
> ham radio lobbyist in Washington.

If my congressman called the FCC it would make an impact. And believe you, me, MY congressman is willing to listen to those of us who sent him to DC.

>  
> > 3) Having watched, over the years, the ARRL's vigorous  
> > opposition to anyone or anything which presumed to encroach  
> > on 'its' territory. Particularly unfortunate, IMO, have been  
> > some of the underhanded efforts to silence anyone who would  
> > either compete for a role or present an opposing opinion.  
>  
> Such as? (Wayne Green is an oft-cited example, but if he's the best you can  
> come up with, you simply don't have a case: he's consistently predicted doom  
> and gloom, and been consistently wrong. He's no more than the Howard Stern of  
> ham magazines.)

W5YI and all the other groups that have proposed to take over the  
'vanity licensing' proposal. Wayne Green bashing is as usefull as ARRL  
bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green isn't claiming to be the 'one true  
voice of amateurs').

>  
> >In the ARRL's defense, I think that much of this has been in the honest  
> >belief that it is necessary to present the FCC bureaucracy with a united  
> >front. The latter is probably sensible, where possible.  
>  
> More than just sensible: essential.

Since when has our (amateur community) relationship with the FCC become  
totally adversarial?

>  
> > However, the  
> >League, in its zeal to do the best thing for the hobby, has all too  
> >often forgotten that this is a pluralistic society.

As I have said, the ARRL is improving. (Can we get rid of incentive  
licensing now guys? Like the social programs of the 60's, it isn't in  
the national interest.) (There I said it, look out now!)

> As a democratic organization, it is obliged to follow the wishes of the  
> majority of its members. If you don't like what it's done, then use the  
> mechanisms in place to change it.

One reason I am thinking about joining Jay.

> >It seems to me that the Board of Directors would do well, in presenting  
> >position papers to the FCC, to pursue a policy of also bringing forward  
> >an occasional 'dissenting opinion,' from within the ranks of amateur  
> >radio. In doing so, they would increase their stock by demonstrating that  
> >they truly ARE representative of amateur radio as a whole.  
>



> No; this would destroy their credibility totally. It would present the League  
> as being uncontrollably wishy-washy.

No. Just honest and truly representative of its members.

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----  
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

-----  
Date: Tue, 7 Dec 1993 14:41:53 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!paladin.american.edu!darwin.sura.net!  
fconvx.ncifcrf.gov!fcs260c!mack@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: How to Calibrate an SWR meter  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec7.113436.4194@bradford.ac.uk> K.E.Walton@bradford.ac.uk (KE  
WALTON) writes:

>

>With the output open and TX full ( being carefull not to blow my rig up )  
>the reflected power should equal the output power.

DONT DO THIS. The whole point of having an SWR meter in the line is to make  
sure that the transmitter always sees a good load. You will blow up your TX.  
If you want to check the SWR meter in the reverse direction, connect it  
in the reverse direction and you should get the same reading with the switch  
now in the reverse position.

REF must mean REFlected power, so otherwise you seem to have it straight.

Joe NA3T  
mack@ncifcrf.gov

-----  
Date: 7 Dec 93 23:44:25 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec3.223244.1@aurora.alaska.edu>,  
<1993Dec5.234801.25658@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1993Dec6.162309.23130@cirrus.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: hypochondriac scared of cancer!

In article <1993Dec6.162309.23130@cirrus.com> ebs@csparc046.cirrus.com (eric smith) writes:

>In article <1993Dec5.234801.25658@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>|> In article <1993Dec3.223244.1@aurora.alaska.edu> fsjtc@aurora.alaska.edu writes:

>|> >I live in a dormitory whose window faces the other dorm building. On top of

>|> >\_that\_ building is a 70 foot radio antennae (I don't know the wattage) that

>|> >broadcasts the college radio station out over the town of Fairbanks, Alaska.

>|> >Yes, people really live there!

>|> >What I want to know is: is having that antennae 100 ft away from my dorm

>|> >room window any kind of health risk? Be honest! I wanna know the facts!

>|> >(it broadcasts at 104.1 fm, if that helps at all.)

>|>

>|> Well if the station is Class A, 3,000 watts, then the field strength at

>|> the antenna is 387.3 V/m and 0.43 V/m at your window for a power density

>|> of 0.32 mW/cm<sup>2</sup>.

>

>Hi Gary,

>

>Could you run through your calculations of power density for me or direct

>me to a reference that has an example of how to do this calculation.

>I have tried to calculate power density based on a toroidal field pattern.

>If I assume no power loss at this distance (bad assumption), I can calculate

>the power density based on the surface area of a toroid 70ft tall (inner radius)

>with a outer radius of 100ft.

>

>  $P_d = P_{in} / (4 \pi R^2 r)$

>

>where  $P_{in}=3000\text{Watts}$   $R=100\text{ft}$  and  $r=70\text{ft}$

>

>When I plug numbers into this eqn, I get about 12uV/cm<sup>2</sup>. This seems to

>be off by more than a order of magnitude. I know I didn't account for

>antenna directivity, but that's not a factor of 1000. Where am I going

>wrong?

The formula is wrong.

Ok, I made a couple of simplifying assumptions, and I cheated the numbers a bit to make it easier to calculate, and then I screwed up. :-(

First I assumed an industry standard Class A transmitter power of 3 kW. It turns out that's correct for this station. I ignored the 5.44 db gain antenna used to bring the main lobe signal up to 10.5 kW ERP. Since our poster is located below the main lobe, this assumption makes the calculation

give a higher value for field strength at his window than actually exists, and it makes the calculation much easier. Now I cheated by assuming that the station was on 2 meters instead of 104.1 MHz. That made a halfwave 1 meter. Then I screwed up by assuming field strength falls off with the inverse \*square\* of distance, it doesn't, power does. Field strength falls off linearly with distance. Arrrgh!

Now let's go through it with more accurate numbers. A halfwave at 104.1 is  $150/104.1$  or 1.44m. Now assuming a free space impedance of 377 ohms the field strength across 1.44 meters is  $\sqrt{3000 \times 377}$  or 1063.48 volts per 1.44m at 1.44m. Now let's normalize the voltage across 1m,  $1063.48/1.44=738.53$  volts/meter at a distance of 1.44m. Now 100 feet is 30.46 meters, so the field strength decreases by  $30.46/1.44=21.15$  times. So the volts per meter at the window is  $738.53/21.15=34.92$  volts per meter. I missed this by a mile before. Note I'm not bothering with slant range from the top of the tower, I'm just taking his 100 feet number for the distance.

Note that the \*tower\* is 70 feet tall according to our poster, but that's not the length of the \*antenna\*. I'm assuming a single bay for simplicity of calculation. That's a halfwave dipole. Now the field strength will be maximum across a sphere with a diameter of a halfwave that just encompasses the element because there's a 180 degree phase shift across a halfwave and that gives maximum voltage. That also happened to be 1 meter in my simplified calculation, but turned into 1.44 meters in the more accurate calculation. Since field strength falls off with the inverse of the distance, and since we know the voltage at 1.44 meters, it's simple to find the voltage at 30.46 meters. Now the power density is  $P=E^2/R$ . Since R for free space is 377 ohms, we have  $34.92^2/377=3.23$  W/m<sup>2</sup>. Now divide that by 100,000 to get 0.0323 milliwatts/cm<sup>2</sup>. I slipped a decimal there before when calculating a power ratio directly. The power density is well below the OSHA and ANSI limits.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	I kill you,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	You kill me,	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	We're the Manson Family	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-sorry Barney	

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1435

\*\*\*\*\*

-----

Date: 7 Dec 1993 19:59:02 GMT

From: slinky.cs.nyu.edu!longlast.cs.nyu.edu!jackson@nyu.arpa

Subject: R/C Aircraft  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Having read the latest '73, I am interested in hearing about the feasibility of installing the necessary electronics to get statistical information from model aircraft via packet.

I envision one person flying the machine while another person pulls statistical data from the machine. Some options would be ssb-tv and computer controlled scanning on board.

Of course, you wouldn't rebroadcast the scanner audio. If the aircraft is large enough, a motherboard with soundcard and scsi-2 hard drive could be shoved in there and the scanner audio could be recorded to the hard drive. The computer could easily relay to base things like how much record time is left, what frequency is being recorded and such. The craft could even take commands for recording and scanning. What about feeding the audio back to base as uuencoded data? I don't think *that* would be allowed.

Starting with the basics, what's the largest model aircraft anyone here has built or can legally be built? What about engines? I recall reading that the man featured in the story converted his airplane's engine to a hacked chainsaw engine to stay away from costly glow fuel.

How expensive does the hobby get and how quickly? Before anyone flips out about the size, Sharp recently released an integrated motherboard/isa drive controller the size of a credit card.

I would specifically like to hear about long distances of r/c (even out of sight if possible). The article quoted his highest altitudes at 500 ft.

I am very interested in hearing from people. TIA.

--

Steven Jackson	New York University
Assistant to the Chair of Comp Sci	Courant Inst. of Mathematical Sciences
jackson@cs.nyu.edu, jcksnste@acfccluster	251 Mercer St, Room 411, NY 10012

-----

Date: 7 Dec 93 11:29:25  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!nigel.msen.com!ilium!  
rcsuna.gmr.com!rcsuna.gmr.com!vbreaault@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Scratchi, January, 1960  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <gregCHo43F.9o4@netcom.com> greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:

The "Scratchi" features, while they may have been acceptable and even amusing in the context of contemporary culture, are not consistent with present-day cultural and ethical sensibilities. They are representative of a time when it was okay to ridicule people of differing races.

Races? Are you sure you read the article? I've just re-read it and found no reference to race at all. I was able to find the word "black" used in "black leather jackets" but that's it.

Scratchi, in my minds eye, is an enthusiastic though semi-literate middle aged man. I would guess he was a cajun, but that may be just the way I inferred the dialect. The world is not perfect. There are lots of Scratchis out there, and some of them want to make a contribution.

I have a Scratchi. He's my son Keith. If all goes well, he may one day be able to fend for himself with a small amount of supervision. At 14 years of age he still has trouble adding numbers yet his cheerful enthusiasm and enjoyment of life are a constant source of my encouragement. Perhaps I should be offended that the story was about an ignorant person. I think not.

I enjoyed reading the account of that one man whose excitement about amateur radio overshadowed his humiliation. A humble man of humble means that was eager to step up to a challenge. A man that looked beyond the criticism to see the opportunity. I think there are too many people today that get hung up on one thing or another and fail to see beyond their (possibly valid) objection.

I believe that everyone has some kind of talent that they can share with someone else. In Scratchi's case it certainly is not a talent of words, but one of enthusiasm and resourcefulness. That story is a story of encouragement. It would seem that if Scratchi could do it, then anyone could do it, and if you're not, then what's your excuse.

ObRadio: Does anyone have plans for a shortened 80m wire antenna? I have about 65 feet to work with, from the peak of my house to the corner of my garage with a 30 foot tower section in the middle. My 40m dipole plays pretty good but my little MFJ tuner can't make a reasonable match at the 75/80m frequencies.

--  
Val Breault - N80EF - vbreault@gmr.com \        /|  
Instrumentation dept GM NAO R&D Center \     / |  
My opinions are not necessarily those of \ /\_\_|  
GMR nor of the General Motors Corporation \ /   |\_\_\_

-----

Date: 9 Dec 93 02:26:59 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: UHa (U of Hartford) club active?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Dan Bowker said:

:  
: Date: 2 Dec 93 21:14:49 -0600  
: From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!mrtnt.ntns.com!tntvax!  
ddb@network.ucsd.edu  
: Subject: UHa (U of Hartford) club active?  
: To: info-hams@ucsd.edu  
:  
: I'm looking for anyone from the University Of Hartford Amateur Radio Club  
: (WA10BY?).  
:  
: Dan Bowker NY9K (Class of '84)  
:

Don't know, but Ladd Nagurney, WA3EEC and Jim Shaheen, N1CQ are both professors  
in the School of Engineering there and would know what's up at U of Hartford.  
Both are good in callbook, Ladd can be reached at nagurney@ecs.umass.edu.

--

Stephen P. Baker	phone: (508) 856-2625
Lecturer in Biostatistics	(508) 856-3131 fax
Department of Academic Computing	(413) 253-3923 home
University of Massachusetts Medical School	e-mail: sbaker@umassmed.ummed.edu
55 Lake Avenue North	-. -.. .---- .--. ...
Worcester, MA 01655	

-----  
Date: 9 Dec 93 01:35:02 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Univ of Hartford ARC  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Sorry for using the net bandwidth, but I couldn't parse  
Dan Bowker's return address.

The University of Hartford ARC is currently dormant. I am  
the trustee of WA10BY. The room where the club was located was reclaimed  
by the University. The remaining equipment is in my Laboratory,

although some had disappeared before I grabbed it.  
The antennas are still up, although the Yagi does  
not turn and recently lost half an element.

Sorry to be the bearer of bad news.

73

Lad Nagurney WA3EEC  
Associate Prof of EE  
nagurney@hartford.bitnet  
nagurney%uhavax.dnet@ipgate.hartford.edu

-----  
Date: 7 Dec 93 19:59:05 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

cbr600@maico.ksu.ksu.edu (Jeremy L. Utley) writes:

> Well, it's because AT is not a valid prefix for US operation (or that's what  
> told). US only has the prefixes AA-AL so AT would be an invalid prefix for th  
> united states. That's also why we can't have A prefix's for 1x3 Tech/General  
> callsigns. :( Here in 0-land, we're just about out of 1x3 calls and most oth  
> areas are already out of them. Seems to me instead of dropping down to 2x3 N  
> the FCC should start recycling old w0 and k0 calls that are no longer used!  
> well, whoever said the buearucracy was sane.  
>  
> Smiley's implied, of course!!!

Here in 8-land we ARE out, AA8xx Extra and KB8xxx Nov/Tec/Gen. Advanced  
still has a bunch left KG or KH last checked. I would have even  
prefered NA8xxx as opposed to a "Novice" call, but to no avail...

--

-----  
| Dan Pickersgill N8PKV | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org | Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----  
| Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!! |  
The Brady Bill is Law.

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1438

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*